REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF 3100 5556, ER 10-08-007 TOR Investments Major Residential Subdivision

December 9, 2011

I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the							
Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICAE	BLE/EXEMPT			
of the Multiple S	pecies Conserva	tion Program		d within the boundaries ormance to the Habitat ired.			
<u>II. MSCP/BMO</u> - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?							
,	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABI	_E/EXEMPT			
The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The project conforms with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance as discussed in the MSCP Findings dated June 17, 2011.							
<u>III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE</u> - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICAE	BLE/EXEMPT			
				icipal Water District urces. The project will			

not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

Steep Slopes:

The average slope for the property is less than 20 percent gradient and elevation ranges from 400 feet to 465 feet over the entire site. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are defined as "steep slopes" and required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

Sensitive habitat lands include unique vegetation communities and/or habitat that is either necessary to support a viable population of sensitive species, is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem, or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor. No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on

a site visit conducted by County staff. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The property has been surveyed by a County approved archaeologist Robert Case and his team on October 5 and 6, 2007, and it has been determined that the property does not contain any archaeological/ historical sites. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

	shed Protec		 Does the project comply winder Additional and Dischage 				
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE				
	May 13, 20		agement Plan prepared by Freviewed and is found to be o				
VI. NOISE ORDINANCE – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE				
The proposal way	ıld not ovno	oo noonlo to i	nor gonorata natantially signi	ficant naise			

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) equal to 60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.